



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/481,069		ALEXANDER BAKMAN	21/99	5153

23521 7590 12/21/2001

SALTAMAR INNOVATIONS
30 FERN LANE
SOUTH PORTLAND, ME 04106

[REDACTED]
EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

[REDACTED]
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TR

TR

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/481,069	BAKMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CESAR B PAULA	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-113 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-113 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 10/5/2001.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-113 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 36, 39, 43, 49, 78, 80,

86, 91, 94, and 95 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 1-30, 32-41, 43, 45-58, 60-77, 78-90, and 96-97 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacson et al (Pat. # 6,065,116, 5/16/2000, filed on 5/7/1997), in view of Danknick et al (Pat. # 5,901,286, 5/4/1999, filed on 11/15/1996) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The rejections of claims 31, 42, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacson et al, in view of Danknick et al, and further in view of Noble et al (Pat. # 5,978,842, 11/2/1999, filed on 7/18/1997) have been withdrawn as necessitated the amendment.

5. The rejection of claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacson et al, in view of Danknick et al, and further in view of Dunphy et al (Pat. # 5,638,509, 6/10/1997, filed on 6/13/1996) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

6. The rejections of claims 91-95 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danknick et al have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

7. The proposed drawing corrections filed on 2/16/2000 have been approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-30, 32-41, 43, 45-58, 60-77, 78-90, 96-106, and 108-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacson et al (Pat. # 6,065,116, 5/16/2000, filed on 5/7/1997), in view of Danknick et al (Pat. # 5,901,286, 5/4/1999, filed on 11/15/1996), and further in view of Poole et al, hereinafter Poole (Pat. # 6,006,242, 12/21/1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: "configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface" (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *A method for automatic production of documentation for configurable computerized systems.....* However, Danknick et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154....." (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the retrieval of configuration information by Isaacson et al and the retrieval, and formatting of configurable parameters into a documentation as shown by Danknick et al (Fig. 10), because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems in order to perform administrative functions on a particular copier computer system.

Moreover, Isaacson et al disclose: *a) retrieving configuration parameters from at least one configurable system having values associated therewith....—“...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface....”* (Col. 2, lines 25-39). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching the request and retrieval of configuration parameters from applications of heterogeneous configurable computer systems.

In addition, Isaacson et al disclose: “configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface....” (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *b) outputting explanatory text segments corresponding with at least one of said configuration parameters and the value.....* However, Danknick et al disclose: “Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154” (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the retrieval of configuration information by Isaacson et al and the retrieval, and formatting of configurable parameters into a documentation as shown by Danknick et al (Fig. 10), because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems in order to perform administrative functions on a particular copier computer system.

Furthermore, Isaacson et al disclose: “configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface....” (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *c).* However, Danknick et al disclose: “Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154” (Col. 7, lines 14-30). Poole teaches the dynamic creation of documents, which comply with a set of requirements, such as government, and including a narrative explanation of corresponding parameters or values associated with the documentation

Art Unit: 2176

(col. 5, lines 15-67, col. 13, lines 18-67, col. 14, lines 1-67, and col. 22, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the retrieval of configuration information by Isaacson et al and the retrieval, organization of information describing configurable parameters into a documentation as shown by Danknick et al (Fig. 10), and the creation of documentation in a narrative fashion as described by Poole, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the querying and control of peripheral devices (col. 1, lines 58-67), and Poole teaches the flexible, and dynamic determination of narrative content to be included in a document (col. 2, lines 2-10).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: "...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface...." (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *automatically selecting said explanatory information by said computer.* However, Danknick et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154" (Col. 7, lines 14-30, and Fig. 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems in order to perform administrative functions on a particular copier computer system.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Isaacson et al disclose: *step of retrieving is performed using a collector computer program operating on a first computer*—"access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 4, lines 44-49). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching a program based on a Windows 95 computer system to collect the configuration information.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 3, Isaacson et al disclose: "...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*interconnection of personal computers via.....Internet*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...interconnection of personal computers to a larger server computer, such as for the Internet" (Col. 1, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 3, Isaacson et al disclose: "...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*the step of downloading said collector program onto said first computer*. However, Danknick et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154....." (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Isaacson et al disclose: "...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*automatically activating said collector after said step of downloading*. However, Danknick et al disclose: "After the web browser receives the executable codeexecution of the code is initiated....." (Col. 2, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 5, Isaacson et al disclose: "...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*initiating said step of downloading from within a World Wide Web Browser*. However, Danknick et al disclose: "After the web browser receives the executable codeexecution of the code is initiated....." (Col. 2, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems.

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, the limitations a) and b) are directed to the steps of claim 1, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Furthermore, Isaacson et al disclose: "access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements" (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *(c) constructing a table of contents for said documentation*. However, Danknick et al disclose: "the browser is instructedto display a second HTML file 140" (Col. 8, lines 17-25, Fig. 7, 10-121). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the formatting of

configuration information to display as in an HTML page, and the querying and control of peripheral devices (col. 1, lines 58-67).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 8, Isaacson et al disclose: "...CLEARPATH HMP IX system, 2200 platform, and UNIX platform....database management....." (Col. 4, lines 32-67). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*at least one selected from a group of a configurable software application, a computer operating system, an electronic messaging system, a database management system.....* However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 1, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 8, Isaacson et al disclose:
"...CLEARPATH HMP IX system, 2200 platform, and UNIX platform....database management....." (Col. 4, lines 32-67). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*said configurable system is selected from a group consisting of a Lotus Notes system, Novel Groupwise system, Microsoft Windows server* However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...interconnection of personal computers to a larger server computer, such as for the Internet" (Col. 1, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 8, Isaacson et al disclose:
"...CLEARPATH HMP IX system, 2200 platform, and UNIX platform....database management....." (Col. 4, lines 32-67). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*said configurable system is a SAP enterprise management system.* However, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...interconnection of personal computers to a larger server computer, such as for the Internet" (Col. 1, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 8, Isaacson et al disclose:

"...CLEARPATH HMP IX system, 2200 platform, and UNIX platform....database management....." (Col. 4, lines 32-67). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*said configurable system is a Microsoft Exchange messaging system.* However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...interconnection of personal computers to a larger server computer, such as for the Internet" (Col. 1, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 8, Isaacson et al disclose:

"...CLEARPATH HMP IX system, 2200 platform, and UNIX platform....database management....." (Col. 4, lines 32-67). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*configurable system is at least one selected from a group of a configurable software application, a computer operating system, an electronic messaging system, a database management system.....* However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...interconnection of personal computers to a larger server computer, such as for the Internet" (Col. 1, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose:

"...CLEARPATH HMP IX system, 2200 platform, and UNIX platform....database management....." (Col. 4, lines 32-67). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*said*

configurable system is at least one selected from a group consisting of a Microsoft Exchange organization, Lotus Notes system Novell Groupwise system However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...interconnection of personal computers to a larger server computer, such as for the Internet" (Col. 1, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose:
"...CLEARPATH HMP IX system, 2200 platform, and UNIX platform....database management....." (Col. 4, lines 32-67). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*said configurable system is a SAP enterprise management system.* However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...interconnection of personal computers to a larger server computer, such as for the Internet" (Col. 1, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose:
"...CLEARPATH HMP IX system, 2200 platform, and UNIX platform....database management....." (Col. 4, lines 32-67). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*said configurable system is a Microsoft Exchange messaging system.* However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...interconnection of personal computers to a larger server computer, such as for the Internet" (Col. 1, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: "...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*two explanatory*

text segments are being grouped in accordance with interrelationship of their corresponding parameters. However, Danknick et al disclose: “the browser is instructedto display a second HTML file 140.....” (Col. 8, lines 17-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al disclose in the above quote, the display of related configuration information in a web page format.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 1, the limitations a) and b) are directed to the steps of claim 1, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Furthermore, Isaacson et al disclose: “...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements....” (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *c) generating an index of at least selected parameters ... detailing relative location of at least one of said selected parameters and...within said document.* However, Danknick et al disclose: “the browser is instructedto display a second HTML file 140” (Col. 8, lines 17-25, and Fig. 7-121). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Danknick et al disclose in the above quote, the display of related configuration information in a web page format.

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: “....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....” (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *a) providing a computer readable set of rulesassociated with one or more configuration parameters.....—* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had

performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose in the above quote, the display and retrieval of configuration requirements for computer applications.

Moreover, Isaacson et al disclose: *b) comparing said retrieved configuration parameters against said set of rules—“....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....”* (Col. 2, lines 40-60). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching the setting of configuration parameters based on the retrieval of configuration requirements.

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 19, Isaacson et al disclose: “....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....” (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*outputting an indication of error conditions if at least one of said configuration parameters violates one or more rule*. However, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al are teaching the setting of configuration parameters based on the retrieval of configuration requirements.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 19, Isaacson et al disclose: ...*indications of desired value.... outputting information conveying desired values--“....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....”* (Col. 2, lines 40-60). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching the setting of configuration parameters based on the retrieval of configuration requirements.

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Isaacson et al disclose: ... *desired values are computably modifiable*-- “....each application program may be properly configured” (Col. 2, lines 59-67). Isaacson et al are teaching the setting of configuration parameters based on the retrieval of configuration requirements.

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: ... *using a collector computer program that collects said configuration parameters*.....-- “....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....” (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al disclose in the previous quote, the retrieval of configuration parameters from a configurable system by a computer program.

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 19, Isaacson et al disclose: “....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....” (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: ...*activating said collector computer program from within a World Wide Web browser*. However, Danknick et al disclose: “The browser....initiates a JAVA virtual machine in order to execute the JAVA applet....” (Col. 8, lines 43-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have performed this step, because Danknick et al disclose above, the retrieval of configuration information through an Internet browser.

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 23, Isaacson et al disclose: “....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....”

Art Unit: 2176

(Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: ... *said collector is an ActiveX program.* However, Danknick et al disclose: "The browser....initiates a JAVA virtual machine in order to execute the JAVA applet....." (Col. 2, lines 40-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Danknick et al disclose above, the retrieval of configuration information through an Internet browser's platform independent software.

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 23, Isaacson et al disclose: ".....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements.....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....." (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: ...*constructing said collector program using the Java programming language.* However, Danknick et al disclose: "The browser....initiates a JAVA virtual machine in order to execute the JAVA applet....." (Col. 2, lines 40-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Danknick et al disclose above, the retrieval of configuration information through an Internet browser.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: "application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements.....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....." (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *explanatory information is arranged in a template having placeholders embedded therein ...merging the values associated with said configuration variable.* However, Danknick et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154....." (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems, and the querying and control of peripheral devices (col. 1, lines 58-67).

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: “application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings” (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*embedding one or more drawings within the document*. However, Danknick et al disclose: “....hypertext tags provide page formatting information to the browser which defines text areas, graphics areas.....” (Col. 8, lines 14-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems.

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: “Element 98 retrieves configuration requirements. Several UNIX commands are issued to the host to obtain information about the UNIX host....” (Col. 5, lines 42-52). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:*storing said retrieved configuration parameters in a database ...retrieve one or more said sets in response to queries*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose in the above quote, the retrieval of configuration requirements from a computer system.

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 29, Isaacson et al disclose: "Element 98 retrieves configuration requirements. Several UNIX commands are issued to the host to obtain information about the UNIX host...." (Col. 5, lines 42-52). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:embedding one or more drawings within the document. However, Danknick et al disclose: "...hypertext tags provide page formatting information to the browser which defines text areas, graphics areas....." (Col. 8, lines 14-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval and display of configuration information from computerized systems.

Regarding claim 32, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: "....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings...." (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose:outputting documentation in a format compatible with a format selected from the group consisting of HTML, Postscript..... However, Danknick et al disclose: "...hypertext tags provide page formatting information to the browser which defines text areas, graphics areas....." (Col. 8, lines 14-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval and display of configuration information from computer applications.

Regarding claim 33, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: ...said computer is integrated into said configurable system--"....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means

may determine the appropriate configuration settings.....” (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval and display of configuration information by a computer which was part of a computer system.

Regarding claim 34, which depends on claim 1, Isaacson et al disclose: *...said computer is integrated into said configurable system--“....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings.....”* (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval and display of configuration information by a computer program which was part of a configurable computer system.

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 2, Isaacson et al disclose: *...step of selecting is being performed by a software module integrated into said configurable system--“....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings.....”* (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval and display of configuration information by a computer program which was part of a configurable computer system.

Claims 36, 38 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1, 4 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 36, Isaacson et al disclose: *.....retrieving comprises a computer program executed on a second computer coupled to said configurable system....via a data network—“...interconnection of personal computers via Local Area Networks...”* (Col. 1, lines 26-30), and “...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry

compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements....” (Col. 4, lines 44-49). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching a program based on a Windows 95 computer system to collect the configuration information via a LAN or Internet.

Regarding independent claim 39, Isaacson et al disclose: *a) a collector computer program adapted to retrieve configuration parameters from at least one configurable system—* “...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface....” (Col. 2, lines 25-39). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching the request and retrieval of configuration parameters from computer systems.

Moreover, Isaacson et al disclose: “.....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements.....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....” (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *i. a template having explanatory information and place holders.* However, Danknick et al disclose: “Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154” (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems, and the querying and control of peripheral devices (col. 1, lines 58-67).

Moreover, Isaacson et al disclose: “.....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements.....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....” (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *ii. a data parser in communication with said collector program adapted to*

parse said configuration parameters into associated values and merge said values into said template. However, Danknick et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154....." (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems.

Furthermore, Isaacson et al disclose: ".....application program interface is also provided to solicit and receive application program configuration requirements.....configuration means may determine the appropriate configuration settings....." (Col. 2, lines 40-60). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *iii. output module adapted to organize said explanatory information...output said template with said merged values in a narrative format descriptive of the configuration of the configurable system* However, Danknick, et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154" (Col. 7, lines 14-30, and Fig. 10). Poole teaches the dynamic creation of documents, which comply with a set of requirements, such as government, and including a narrative explanation of corresponding parameters or values associated with the documentation (col. 5, lines 15-67, col. 13, lines 18-67, col. 14, lines 1-67, and col. 22, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, and the creation of documentation in a narrative fashion as described by Poole, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval, and organizing of configuration information from computerized systems in order to perform administrative functions on a particular copier computer system, and the querying and control of peripheral devices (col. 1,

lines 58-67), and Poole teaches the flexible, and dynamic determination of narrative content to be included in a document (col. 2, lines 2-10).

Claims 40-41, 45-48 are directed towards a system for implementing the method found in claims 20, 29, 9, 11-12, and 32 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 43, Isaacson et al disclose: "access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *a) Downloading a collector computer program to a first computer.....* However, Danknick et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154....." (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems.

Moreover, Isaacson et al disclose: *b) collecting configuration parameters*— "...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 4, lines 44-49). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching a program based on a Windows 95 computer system to collect the configuration information.

In addition, Isaacson et al disclose: "...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface...." (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *c) transmitting said configuration parameters into a second computer.....* Isaacson et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval and display of configuration information from computerized systems into a second computer.

In addition, Isaacson et al disclose: "configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface...." (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *d) outputting a document comprising explanatory information... said portion of said configuration parametersiii. a table of contents detailing relative location of at least certain segments of said explanatory text.* However, Danknick et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154" (Col. 7, lines 14-30, and Fig. 7, 10). Poole teaches the dynamic creation of documents, which comply with a set of requirements, such as government, and including a narrative explanation of corresponding parameters or values associated with the documentation (col. 5, lines 15-67, col. 13, lines 18-67, col. 14, lines 1-67, and col. 22, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, and the creation of documentation in a narrative fashion as described by Poole, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems, and the querying and control of peripheral devices (col. 1, lines 58-67), and Poole teaches the flexible, and dynamic determination of narrative content to be included in a document (col. 2, lines 2-10).

Regarding independent claim 49, Isaacson et al disclose: "configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface" (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *A method for automatic production of documentation for configurable computerized systems.* However, Danknick et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154....." (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the

retrieval of configuration information by Isaacson et al and the retrieval, and formatting of configurable parameters into a documentation as shown by Danknick et al (Fig. 10), because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems in order to perform administrative functions on a particular copier computer system.

Moreover, Isaacson et al disclose: "access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements" (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *a) coupling a computer via an Intranet*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose: "...interconnection of personal computers via Local Area Networks...." (Col. 1, lines 26-30).

In addition, Isaacson et al disclose: *b) retrieving configuration parameters having values associated therewith....—“...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface....”* (Col. 2, lines 25-39). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching the request and retrieval of configuration parameters.

Moreover, Isaacson et al disclose: "...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface" (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *c) outputting explanatory information corresponding with at least one of said configuration parameters and the value.....* However, Danknick et al disclose: "Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154....." (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the retrieval of configuration information by Isaacson et al and the retrieval, and

Art Unit: 2176

formatting of configurable parameters into a documentation as shown by Danknick et al (Fig. 10), because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems in order to perform administrative functions on a particular copier computer system.

Furthermore, limitation d) is directed to the steps of claim 1, and are therefore similarly rejected.

Claims 50-53 are directed towards a method for implementing the method found in claims 2-3, 25-26 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 54, which depends on claim 49, Isaacson et al disclose:

.....automatically retrieving said configuration parameters in accordance with a predetermined schedule—“...If access was successful, decisional element 114 passes control to element 120....Element 120 retrieves configuration requirements...” (Col. 5, lines 63-67). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching a program which retrieves the configuration information if access to OS2200 was successful—*predetermined schedule*.

Claims 55-58 are directed towards a method for implementing the method found in claims 8-10, and 57 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

Claims 60-77, are directed towards the method found in claims 32, 9-12, 32, 17, 8, 19-22, 27-28, 4, 29-30, and 27 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

Claims 78-80 is directed towards a system for implementing the method found in claims 49, 37, and 39 respectively, and are likewise rejected.

Claim 81 is directed towards a method for implementing the method found in claim 39, and is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 82, which depends on claim 80, Isaacson et al disclose: “database management and communication functions of OS2200 CMS 48 and RDMS 50, may be automatically configured to communicate with other application programs”, and “Element 98 retrieves configuration requirements. Several UNIX commands are issued to the host to obtain information about the UNIX host” (Col. 5, lines 11-25, and 42-52). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *storing said retrieved configuration parameters in a database ...retrieve one or more said sets in response to queries.* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had performed this step, because Isaacson et al disclose in the above quote, the retrieval of configuration requirements from a computer system with a Database Management application.

Claims 83-84 are directed towards a system for implementing the method found in claims 31, and 4 respectively, and are likewise rejected.

Claims 85, 87-90 are directed towards a method for implementing the method found in claims 32, 19, 9, 74, and 32 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 86, Isaacson et al disclose: *a) retrieving configuration parameters from a configurable system....—“...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface....”* (Col. 2, lines 25-39). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching the request and retrieval of configuration parameters.

Further, Isaacson et al disclose: “...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface....” (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *b) selecting explanatory information in accordance with said configuration parameters.* However, Danknick et al disclose: “Current configuration settings are displayed in

such fields such as fields 152, 154" (Col. 7, lines 14-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems.

Furthermore, Isaacson et al disclose: "...access by the user of WINDOWS 95 based industry compatible platform to large scale mainframe system elements...." (Col. 4, lines 44-49). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *c) outputting.... a document comprising said explanatory information ii) values associated with said configuration parameters.... a table of contents.* However, Danknick et al disclose: "the browser is instructedto display a second HTML file 140" (Col. 8, lines 17-25). Poole teaches the dynamic creation of documents, which comply with a set of requirements, such as government, and including a narrative explanation of corresponding parameters or values associated with the documentation (col. 5, lines 15-67, col. 13, lines 18-67, col. 14, lines 1-67, and col. 22, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Danknick et al, and the creation of documentation in a narrative fashion as described by Poole, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the formatting of configuration information to display as in an HTML page, and Poole teaches the flexible, and dynamic determination of narrative content to be included in a document (col. 2, lines 2-10).

Claims 96-97 are directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable media for storing the steps found in claims 36, and 78 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

Claims 98-106, 108-111 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claim 1, and therefore are similarly rejected.

10. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacson et al, in view of Danknick et al, and further in view of Noble et al (Pat. # 5,978,842, 11/2/1999, filed on 7/18/1997).

Regarding independent claim 31, Isaacson et al disclose: *a) storing a first set of configuration parameters from a configurable system*—“...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface, and further retrieves relevant configuration files....” (Col. 2, lines 25-39). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching the request and retrieval of files with configuration parameters—*first set*.

Moreover, Isaacson et al disclose: *b) storing a second set of configuration parameters from a configurable system*—“...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface, and further retrieves relevant configuration files....” (Col. 2, lines 25-39). In this quote, Isaacson et al are teaching the request and retrieval of files with configuration parameters—*second set*.

Furthermore, Isaacson et al disclose: “...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface, and further retrieves relevant configuration files” (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *c) outputting explanatory differences between said first and second sets of configuration parameters*. However, Noble et al disclose: “Symantec’s Internet Fast Find.....periodically fetches a web page from the Internet and compares the newly fetched page to an archived copy of the page. If a mis-match occurs, the user is notified that a change was detected, by a pop-up message window and a highlighted bookmark.....” (Col. 1, lines 30-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Noble et al,

because Noble et al teach: "Users often wish to know when changes are made to certain web pages." (Col. 1, lines 30-67).

11. Claims 42, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacson et al, in view of Danknick et al, further in view of Poole and further in view of Noble et al (Pat. # 5,978,842, 11/2/1999, filed on 7/18/1997).

Claims 42, 44 are directed towards the method found in claims 31, and 32 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

12. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacson et al, in view of Danknick et al, and further in view of Poole, and further in view of Dunphy et al (Pat. # 5,638,509, 6/10/1997, filed on 6/13/1996).

Regarding claim 59, which depends on claim 49, limitations a)-c) are directed towards the steps found in claim 8, and are therefore likewise rejected.

Moreover, Isaacson et al disclose: "...configuration program solicits user configuration from a user through a user interface, and further retrieves relevant configuration files" (Col. 2, lines 25-39). Isaacson et al fail to explicitly disclose: *d) maintaining an activity log detailing operations of said steps of retrieving and outputting*. However, Dunphy et al disclose: "present invention which maintains an index of all data file activity on a computer system" (Col. 1, lines 54-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Isaacson et al and Dunphy et al, because Dunphy et al teach: "...to enable a user to recreate the state of the computer system at any selected point in time...." (Col. 1, lines 56-67).

13. Claims 91-95, 107, and 112-113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danknick et al.

Regarding independent claim 91, Danknick et al disclose: *a) - b)--“Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154”* (Col. 7, lines 14-30, Fig.7, 10). Danknick et al teach the retrieval, merging, organization of the configuration parameters next to their respective explanatory text fragments, and formatting of configurable parameters into HTML documentation—“SNMP client and browser”. Danknick fails to explicitly disclose *outputting explanatory information in a narrative format descriptive of the configuration of the configurable system.* Poole teaches the dynamic creation of documents, which comply with a set of requirements, such as government, and including a narrative explanation of corresponding parameters or values associated with the documentation (col. 5, lines 15-67, col. 13, lines 18-67, col. 14, lines 1-67, and col. 22, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Danknick et al, and the creation of documentation in a narrative fashion as described by Poole, because Danknick et al teach in the quote above, the retrieval of configuration information from computerized systems, and the querying and control of peripheral devices (col. 1, lines 58-67), and Poole teaches the flexible, and dynamic determination of narrative content to be included in a document (col. 2, lines 2-10).

Regarding claim 92, which depends on claim 91, Danknick et al disclose: *..said software module is embedded within said configurable system--“Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154.....The settings are obtained by an SNMP client*

within the workstation...." (Col. 7, lines 14-30). The "SNMP client and browser" components embedded into the computer system taught by Danknick et al.

Regarding claim 93, which depends on claim 91, Danknick et al disclose: *said software module is constructed to be integrated into said configurable system--"Current configuration settings are displayed in such fields such as fields 152, 154.....The settings are obtained by an SNMP client within the workstation...."* (Col. 7, lines 14-30). The "SNMP client and browser" are installable components into the computer system taught by Danknick et al.

Claim 94 is directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claim 1, and is similarly rejected.

Claim 95 is directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable media for storing the steps found in claim 91, and is similarly rejected.

Claims 107, and 112-113 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claim 1, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1-97 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In response to applicant's arguments that the references fail to show the organization of explanatory information in a document presented in a narrative fashion (p.15, lines 5-15). These features are directed towards the newly amended subject matter, therefore, the Applicants are directed toward the rejection of these limitations above.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. IBOK (Pat. # 6,232,244), SLODOWSKI et al. (Pat. # 4,970,678), BROOKS et al. (Pat. # 4,992,972), ANDERSEN (Pat. # 6,226,657), and MULTI-ENVIRONMENT PREPROCESSOR FOR DOCUMENTATION PUBLISHING SYSTEM, IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, vol. 37, iss.# 4B, April 1994.

Art Unit: 2176

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7238, (for **After Final** communications intended for entry)
- (703) 746-7239, (for **Formal** communications intended for entry)

Or:

- (703) 746-7240, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label “**PROPOSED**” or “**DRAFT**”).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

12/5/01


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER